Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

COAST TO COAST INVESTMENTS

Plaintiff,

v.

SERGIO L. LUNA; JENNIFER GARCIA; and PEDRO GARCIA

Defendants.

Case No. 13-04602 JSC

HAT THE CASE BE REMANDED

Plaintiff brought this state law unlawful detainer action against Defendant Sergio L. Luna and Does 1-25 in the Superior Court of California for the County of Contra Costa seeking to evict Defendants from real property located in Brentwood, California. Defendants Jennifer Garcia and Pedro Garcia, renters of the property at issue, and representing themselves, subsequently purported to remove the action to this Court on the basis of federal question jurisdiction. Given the Court's concern with respect to subject matter jurisdiction, the Court ordered Defendants to show cause as to why this case should not be remanded to Superior Court of California for the County of Contra Costa. (Dkt. No. 5.) Defendants failed to respond to the Court's Order.

DISCUSSION

As the parties have neither consented to nor declined the undersigned magistrate judge's jurisdiction, the Clerk of the Court is ordered to reassign this action to a district court United States District Court

Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

judge. For the reasons explained below, this Court recommends that the newly assigned district judge REMAND this action to the Superior Court of California for the County of Contra Costa.

Defendants, as the parties seeking removal to this federal court, bear the burden of establishing that subject matter jurisdiction exists, and courts strictly construe the removal statute against removal jurisdiction. Gaus v. Miles, Inc., 980 F.2d 564, 566-67 (9th Cir. 1992). Further, when a case is removed to federal court, the court has an independent obligation to satisfy itself that it has federal subject matter jurisdiction. Valdez v. Allstate *Ins. Co.*, 372 F.3d 1115, 1116 (9th Cir. 2004).

The Court has reviewed the Notice of Removal and has determined that federal question jurisdiction does not exist. "Federal question jurisdiction exists only when a federal question exists on the face of a well-pleaded complaint." ING Bank, FSB v. Pineda, No. 12-2418, 2012 WL 2077311, at *1 (N.D. Cal. June 8, 2012). The removed complaint makes only a state law claim for unlawful detainer. (Dkt. No. 1-1, p. 10.) That Defendants' answer raises federal questions is irrelevant; a defendant cannot create federal subject matter jurisdiction by adding claims or raising defenses. Holmes Group, Inc. v. Vornado Air Circulation, 535 U.S. 826, 830-31 (2002); Federal Nat. Mortg. Ass'n v. Sue Lin Poh, No. 12-2707, 2012 WL 3727266, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2012) (remanding removed unlawful detainer action). Defendants therefore cannot demonstrate that federal question jurisdiction exists.1

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, this Court RECOMMENDS that the newly assigned district court judge REMAND this action to the Superior Court of California for the County of Contra Costa.

¹ Further, even were Defendants' contentions as to federal question jurisdiction maintainable, Defendants appear to be citizens of California as the underlying complaint alleges that they are in possession of property in California. The removal therefore contravenes the provision of 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b) that precludes removal where any defendant is a citizen of the state in which the action was brought (the "no local defendant rule").

Case 4:13-cv-04602-PJH Document 6 Filed 10/29/13 Page 3 of 3

United States District Court

Any party may file objections to this report and recommendation with the district
court judge within fourteen days after being served with a copy. See 28 U.S.C.
§636(b)(1)(B); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); Civil L.R. 72-3. Failure to file objections within the
specified time may waive the right to appeal the district court's ultimate Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 29, 2013

JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE